DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 007 HE 022 326

AUTHOR Bowman, John E.
TITLE Educating American Undergraduates Abroad: The Development of Study Abroad Programs by American Colleges and Universities. Occasional Papers on International Educational Exchange, No. 24.
INSTITUTION Council on International Educational Exchange, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 56p.
AVAILABLE FROM Council on International Educational Exchange, 205 E. 42nd St., New York, NY 10017 ($4.00 plus $1.00 postage).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Programs; Cultural Exchange; *Educational History; Higher Education; Intercultural Communication; *International Educational Exchange; *Program Development; *Study Abroad; Undergraduate Study

ABSTRACT

A history of the development of study abroad programs by U.S. colleges and universities is presented in the following chapters: (1) "The Origin of Study Abroad Programs"; (2) "The Issues in Study Abroad"; (3) "The 'Proliferation' of Study Abroad Programs"; (4) "The Seventies: New Patterns for Study Abroad Programs"; (5) "Some Examples of Institutional Involvement"; (6) "The Student Population"; (7) "The Academic Program"; (8) "The Evaluation of Study Abroad Programs"; (9) "Current Problems in Study Abroad"; and (10) "The Future of Study Abroad." Two charts are appended that give the dates of study abroad programs sponsored by 82 U.S. colleges and universities and the number of study abroad programs sponsored by those institutions, by areas of the world. Contains 37 references. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

CIE OCCASIONAL PAPERS No. 24
on International Educational Exchange
Research Series

ED305007

Educating American Undergraduates Abroad

The Development of Study Abroad Programs by American Colleges and Universities

John E. Bowman

HE 022 326

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Council on International Educational Exchange
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Council on International Educational Exchange 205 East 42nd Street, New York NY 10017

Price: $4.00 per copy

Copyright © 1987 by the
Council on International Educational Exchange
205 E. 42nd Street
New York, N.Y. 10017

Educating American Undergraduates Abroad

The Development of Study Abroad Programs by American Colleges and Universities

John E. Bowman

Foreword by Jack Egle

November 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD 5

PREFACE 7

INTRODUCTION 9

Part I: The Origin of Study Abroad Programs 13

The Tradition of Study in Europe 13
The First Junior Year Abroad Programs 13
Revival After World War II 14
The New Post-War Programs 15

Part II: The Issues in Study Abroad 17

The National Conference on Study Abroad Programs 17
Other Meetings 18
The Questions Debated 19
Adjustment to the Foreign University 20
The Problem of Cultural Immersion 21

Part III: The "Proliferation" of Study Abroad Programs 23

The Programs of Large Universities 23
The Programs of Private Colleges 25
The End of the Sixties 26

Part IV: The Seventies: New Patterns for Study Abroad Programs 27

Cooperative and Consortia Programs 28
Independent and Foreign Proprietary Programs 28
One-to-One Reciprocal Programs 29
Community College Programs 29

Part V: Some Examples of Institutional Involvement 31

Gustavus Adolphus College 31
University of Pennsylvania 31
Texas A & M University 32

Part VI: The Student Population 33

Part VII: The Academic Program 35

Development of the Course of Study 35
Summer Programs 37

Part VIII: The Evaluation of Study Abroad Programs 39

Recognizing the Need 39
Approaches to the Evaluation of Study Abroad Programs 39
How Should Study Abroad Programs be Evaluated? 42
The Future of Evaluation 43

Part IX: Current Problems in Study Abroad 45

The Need to Expand Opportunities for Foreign Study 45
The Need to Preserve Cross-Cultural Encounter 46
Problems of Third World Programs 47

Part X: The Future of Study Abroad 49

Appendix 52

Chart I: Dates of Study Abroad Programs Sponsored by 82 U.S. Colleges and Universities 52

Chart II: Number of Study Abroad Programs Sponsored by 82 U.S. Colleges and Universities by Areas of the World 53

Bibliography and Sources of Data 54

FOREWORD

The brief history of study abroad that follows gives the bare bones of what may prove to be a period of great impact on American education and, consequently, on American life. It is the story of the democratization of access to foreign experience for American students and, moreover, the story of a renaissance that opened the undergraduate mind to a wider world. Indeed, education in America may ultimately achieve that universality after which it has occasionally striven, in part because of the pressure created by study abroad.

The experiences covered here have also been noted by others. The Europeans, with their newly established ERASMUS program, are recognizing the need and the potential benefits of organizing and supporting the concept and the fact. The Americans still have a long way to go before study in a foreign culture becomes a regular part of the curriculum for the majority, but growth has been so substantial that one may begin to see a glimmer of potential.

John Bowman, the author, both lived this history and to some extent helped to fashion it. His post-war experience in European relief work, followed by 27 years as Executive Director of CIEE gave him a front row seat at events as they unfolded. His analytical skills applied to that experience give us a clear picture.

Jack Egle
President-Executive Director
Council on International Educational Exchange

New York
November 1987

PREFACE

About This Paper

This paper was prepared as a background document for a colloquium on "New Facts and Alternative Futures: Strategies for International Educational Exchange" convened by the National Association for Foreign Student Affairs with support from a grant to NAFSA from the United States Information Agency. The purpose of the colloquium and of this paper is to contribute to more effective planning of international programs by American colleges and universities.

The preparation of the paper was made possible by the Council on International Educational Exchange which allowed me to devote time to the project and which provided the necessary office assistance.

The Two Surveys

Reference is made in the paper to the results of two surveys carried out in August 1984. The first was a Program Survey which requested the dates on which study abroad programs sponsored by colleges and universities were inaugurated and, if not still in operation, the closing dates. This was mailed to a list of 100 institutions including the academic members of CIEE and a selected number of the larger programs sponsored by institutions which are not members of CIEE. Sixty-eight usable responses had been received when the paper was first drafted, but statistics in this version of the paper incorporate data from an additional 14 questionnaires. A summary of the Program Survey data is found in Chart I of the appendix. The second survey was an Opinion Survey sent to thirty experienced program administrators asking their judgment on a number of questions relating to the programs for which they were responsible. Twenty-two of these had been received when the paper was written.

A Note on Numbers

Substantial use has been made of statistics from the Program Survey mentioned earlier which show the number of programs in existence and the student enrollment in them. It should be noted that those completing the questionnaire were asked to list only quarter, semester and year-long programs; programs in Europe sponsored by single institutions were not to be listed if enrollment was less than ten students and consortial programs and non-European programs were to be excluded if the enrollment from the responding institution was less than five students. Enrollment figures were to represent average program size in recent years.

These figures do not give a basis for an accurate projection of the total number of American study abroad programs or their total student enrollment. Such projections are difficult to make and did not seem essential for this discussion of trends in the field. It did seem useful to compare some of the figures shown in this survey with those appearing in the survey of U.S. students abroad in Open Doors, the annual statistical survey published by the Institute of International Education.

The IIE survey uses a definition of study abroad programs somewhat similar to the one used in this survey, although no minimum number of students per program is specified. The survey for 1982-83 reports that there were 654 programs enrolling

27,145 students. This may somewhat under-report the number of programs since our Program Survey of 68 institutions shows about 300 programs with over 10,000 students enrolled. Our survey should nevertheless include a sufficient proportion of the existing programs to lend some validity to our observations about trends. For instance, of the 300 programs reported in our survey, about 200 (67%) were situated in Europe, and 75 (25%) were in Africa, Asia or Latin America. In the Open Doors statistics, of the 654 programs reported, 476 (73%) were located in Europe and 130 (20%) were in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Some People Who Helped

I wish to express my appreciation to a number of administrators of study abroad programs for the time and attention they gave to filling out the questionnaires sent to them and for sending helpful background data and publications.

I particularly want to thank the authors of several historical studies which have been useful sources of information: Stephen A. Freeman, former vice president of Middlebury College, for his comprehensive history of the Middlebury College Foreign Language Schools; John M. Clayton, Jr., university archivist at the University of Delaware, for his comments and notes on the Delaware programs; Judith Laikin Elkin for her history of the Great Lakes Colleges Association which describes their study abroad programs; Francis M. Roger, former dean at Harvard and R. John Matthew, former director of Sweet Briar's Junior Year in France, for their two booklets on the Sweet Briar program; Gerhard Hess, Director of International Education at Rockland Community College, for his study of community college programs; and Ruth H. Purkaple, former Director of Study Abroad at the University of Colorado for her useful historical report on the Colorado program.

I want to extend special appreciation to Irwin Abrams for his several papers on the history of study abroad programs and for the encouragement and advice he has extended to me and to others who may have recorded the history of their programs or may do so in the future.

John E. Bowman

INTRODUCTION

Any assessment of the international outreach of American education in the last quarter of the twentieth century would identify several major undertakings of American colleges and universities. One of these would certainly be the education of a half million foreign students each year; another would be the massive contribution to the economic development of Third World countries which American universities have made.

A third undertaking -- the subject of this paper -- is the very substantial development of "study abroad" programs through which American universities annually send forty or fifty thousand American students for study in foreign countries. It is by far the major educational exchange program in which American university students are involved. This paper will survey the development of these programs and attempt to analyze current trends in the field.

The first seven parts of the paper will describe the process by which the opportunities for American undergraduates to take part of their four-year course in a foreign country developed from an exotic option in the 1950s to a normal choice for most students in the 1980s. The next part of the paper will discuss the evaluation of study abroad programs. The last part of the paper will outline several of the most pressing problems which institutions sponsoring study abroad programs face at present and make some suggestions about how they are likely to deal with these problems in the future.

There is, of course, a striking difference in the manner in which students from abroad find their way into the student body of an American university and the way in which American students are sent abroad. With few exceptions, foreign students arrive on the American campus as individuals; they have individual educational goals, they deal with the university bureaucracy as individuals, they have individually determined courses of study and participate as individually registered students in the classes they attend. The American participants in a "study abroad" program arrive at the foreign university as members of a group of American students. Their university admission is through an agreement between an American university and the foreign university they are entering. They enroll in a sequence of classes that have been designed to meet the educational needs of the American group. They have an American professor on the site to mediate with the foreign university bureaucracy. They undergo special examinations at the end of their courses, and their grades are transmitted to their home university which issues American credits -- the kind of academic currency they need to acquire a college degree.

Those of us who have participated in international meetings of educators have occasionally suggested that foreign universities would do well to adopt such a system in order to send similar groups of their students to American universities. Our foreign colleagues have pointed out that their approach to university education is quite different from the American system and that the "study abroad" pattern of student exchange is neither appropriate for the needs of their students nor compatible with their system of higher education.

We had, it appears, become victims of semantic entrapment by our use of the phrase "student exchange." That phrase lures us into thinking that sending students to a foreign country is always part of a process in which essentially similar experiences for students are "exchanged" by two nations. It tends to

obscure the obvious fact that the students from the two nations may have quite different experiences when they go abroad. They may have had differing preparations for the sojourn abroad; they have different educational objectives and personal expectations. They encounter the foreign culture in different ways and their relation to the foreign university is quite different.

The "study abroad" program is a uniquely American invention that is peculiarly appropriate to the American system of higher education. Its objectives reflect the strongly American commitment of the university to train citizens as well as scholars. Its focus on Europe reflects the dominant role which European art and literature plays in American culture and in the curriculum of American universities. Its emphasis on group programs derives from the days when the college's role was to serve in loco parentis and continues because the type of program which has developed appears to operate more successfully on a group basis. Its insertion into the context of the American undergraduate curriculum is only possible because of the mechanistic way in which the American student compiles a series of course credits on the way to an undergraduate degree.

The rapidity with which study abroad programs became an accepted part of a student's undergraduate options demonstrates their appropriateness to the American academic scene. This should not obscure the fact that numerous controversies accompanied their growth. There were professors who argued, probably correctly, that instruction on the home campus was better than the instruction students received overseas. Others deplored the reduced enrollment in their advanced language classes. There were deans who were reluctant to place their imprimatur on courses which operated outside the scope of their oversight. There were registrars who lacked the imagination to translate the foreign experiences into contact hours and academic credits. There were business offices which found it difficult to set up budget and control functions which allowed for the complexity of operations in a series of foreign economies.

It is not surprising that many of the early programs resulted from the initiatives of presidents, provosts and deans who could exercise their authority as well as their persuasion to resolve the administrative problems posed by these new programs. They were abetted by a group of faculty who served as administrators of the early programs and who brought to their tasks enormous energy and an entrepreneurial bent. Even more important were the generations of students who participated in these programs and returned to their campuses with reports of educational excitement and exotic experiences.

PART I: THE ORIGIN OF STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS

Today's study abroad programs trace their inception directly to the junior year abroad programs of ivied Eastern colleges. The term, "junior year abroad," was invented in the 1920s; the term, "study abroad," was coined in the late 1950s when a number of American colleges began to send students abroad in their sophomore or junior year, and a broader term was needed. "Study abroad" has become the more common term only in the 1980s.

There are some interesting historical factors which have operated to produce the educational programs that we refer to as "junior year abroad" or "study abroad" programs. It is probably useful to review them.

The Tradition of Study in Europe

In colonial America, higher learning was almost the exclusive province of the clergy. Harvard College was founded in 1636, only 16 years after the arrival of the Pilgrims, and its principal function was the training of clergymen. In Virginia, young men wishing to train for the ministry were sent to England until William and Mary was founded in 1693. In Pennsylvania, clergy for the Lutheran churches studied in Germany. As training for other professions developed, young colonials were sent to European universities. In the nineteenth century, many American doctors were trained in Paris, later in Vienna. The rising prestige of German universities attracted many Americans for doctoral studies. From this, a strong tradition of study in Europe developed, and it has continued throughout the present century.

Not all European study was professional study. Southern families sent their young men to England for both pre-university and university education. Thomas Jefferson lamented the bad habits that young men acquired in Europe, and this encouraged him to found the University of Virginia. Near the end of the nineteenth century, Americans began to regard their own universities as equal to those in Europe, and young men no longer regarded study in Europe as the preferred professional training. The situation for young women was quite different. European educational institutions at the university level were not open to women. The first colleges for women and the first co-educational colleges in the United States were both founded in the 1830s, and the University of Michigan was in 1870 the first university to open its classes to women. Young American women who traveled to Europe went with their families or in the care of a "maiden aunt." By the late nineteenth century, professors at several institutions were conducting groups of young ladies on educational tours in Europe, visiting museums, cathedrals and the like.

The First Junior Year Abroad Programs

The junior year programs prior to World War II were, with one exception, operated by women's colleges and, at first, enrollment was limited to women. They were thus, in part, a transformation of the European tour for young women into an academic experience.

The one exception was the first program to be established. Professor Raymond Kirkbride, who taught at Delaware College, (later the University of Delaware), began urging in 1921 that his institution establish a program whereby students could, properly supervised, of course, study for a year in Paris and receive

credit at their home institution. He had conceived the idea while studying in Grenoble in 1919 after his discharge from military service during World War I. His president, Dr. Walter Hullihan, liked the idea and arranged for Kirkbride to spend a year in France developing the plan. The first group sailed for Europe on July 7, 1923. It included eight students, six from Delaware and two from other colleges. They were all men although the program was theoretically open to women. They had several months of language training at the University of Nancy and began classes at the Sorbonne in November -- primarily in courses of the "Cours de Civilisation" -- a special institute for foreign students. The program grew rapidly; there were 45 students in 1926-27, and by 1931-32 there were 95 students from 35 institutions. Numbers declined during the 1930s (Clayton, 1970; Rogers, 1958).

Other institutions adopted similar plans. Marymount College in Tarrytown, New York, sent seven students, accompanied by a teacher, to Paris in 1924 and permitted students to go to other cities where they lived in facilities belonging to its religious order. Smith College launched a program in Paris in 1925, and in the same year, Rosary College in Forest River, Illinois, sent four young women to a center they had established in Fribourg, Switzerland, several years earlier. Three new programs were established in the 1930s. In 1930, Marymount sent several students and a teacher to Rome, and in 1931, Smith established a second program in Florence. Delaware established the first German program in Munich in 1932; Delaware withdrew its sponsorship of this program in 1934, but it continued under the auspices of an independent committee until 1938-39 when it operated for one year in Switzerland before being discontinued until after World War II (Clayton, 1970; Ebelke, 1951).

The growth of these programs during the 1920s suggests that there was considerable enthusiasm and substantial support for them. America was very interested in Europe in the 1920s. Pierre S. du Pont and others made substantial contributions to the Delaware program's operating and scholarship funds. In 1927, Dr. Stephen Duggan, director of the recently formed Institute of International Education, organized a Committee on the Junior Year Abroad, which included the presidents of Smith College and the University of Delaware. Dr. Duggan served as chairman and a member of the IIE staff was the secretary. IIE also secured some scholarship money from private donors for junior year abroad students in need of financial assistance.

Revival After World War II

World War II, of course, forced the suspension of all of the programs in Europe. The Delaware group of 42 students sailed for France in August 1939 and had just arrived at the site of their six-week orientation/language program in Poitiers when the War broke out; they promptly reboarded a ship for the United States (Rogers, 1958). The sisters from Rosary College used their center in Fribourg to house refugees and convalescing Swiss soldiers; the last two remained until April of 1942 and departed through Lisbon (Altenhofen, 1977).

By the end of the War, all of the institutions had laid plans for the revival of their programs. Two of the sisters from Rosary returned to Fribourg in the fall of 1946, and the first students arrived in the fall of 1947. Delaware's French program was located in Geneva in 1946-47 and 1947-48, then returned to Paris in 1948-49. However, in 1948, Delaware withdrew its sponsorship of the program for financial and political reasons; the new president at Delaware felt that the program served few Delaware students and was somehow inconsistent with his

appeals for increased state support for the University (Clayton, 1970). At this point, Sweet Briar College offered to assume responsibility for the program. Professor Joseph Barker, of the Sweet Briar faculty, who had served as resident director in Paris during the 1930s, negotiated the transfer of the program's sponsorship (Matthew, 1973). The German program was carried on by Professor Edward Miller of the University of Maryland, also a former resident director of the program. The program operated under the auspices of an independent committee called the American Council on College Study in Switzerland with one section operating in Zurich from 1946 to 1951 and another section in Basel from 1948 to 1950 (Ebelke, 1951).

When the German programs in Switzerland were closed, Professor John Ebelke of Wayne State University, who had directed in Basel, persuaded Wayne to assume sponsorship, and the first group returned to Munich in 1953-54 under Wayne's aegis (Ebelke, 1951). Smith's French program was re-instituted in Geneva in 1946, and it returned to Paris in 1949. Smith also continued to operate a program in Geneva.

Revival of the programs in Europe was aided by the reorganized Committee on the Junior Year Abroad which in 1945 became the Council on the Junior Year Abroad. Operating under the sponsorship of the Institute of International Edcuation, the Council met annually to review the various programs and establish policies on "recognition, criteria and academic standards (non-obligatory)." The Council consisted of representatives from institutions operating programs and from those sending students and included four former resident directors. It also served as an advisory group for the Sweet Briar program, having in 1948 officially approved transfer of the program from Delaware to Sweet Briar College (IIE, 1950).

The New Post-War Programs

In the years immediately following World War II, life in Western Europe was disorganized and difficult. Travel was slow and frequently disrupted. Food was rationed, even in Switzerland. University facilities were frequently not yet restored. Housing was scarce and in poor condition. Americans, including students, were encouraged to stay at home because of conditions in Europe. When the Salzburg Seminar -- a summer conference for European and American students -- convened for the first time in the summer of 1948, "all food, with the exception of fresh vegetables, was shipped from the United States" (Educational Reconstruction Conference, 1949).

The first new post-war programs were graduate-level language programs established by Middlebury College in Paris in 1949 and in Madrid in 1951. These programs were part of programs at Middlebury leading to an M.A. degree, but at a later date undergraduates were also admitted (Freeman, 1975). In 1951, Fordham University inaugurated an honors program under which senior students were permitted to study at universities in Paris, Rome and Louvain on an essentially individual basis. Sarah Lawrence College began a program in Paris in 1953. Georgetown, in 1954, sent small groups to Paris, to Fribourg in Switzerland and to a German university.

An interesting aspect of this period is that about half of the men in the Sweet Briar program had their education financed by the G.I. Bill educational grants. Many of them had served in military campaigns in Europe and owed their interest to these experiences (Rogers, 1958). None of these early programs departed very much from prior patterns. They were programs designed for carefully supervised

groups of students or in programs for men allowing enrollment on an individual basis.

In the 1950s, there were some different approaches to study abroad, reflecting different types of educational institutions and different educational objectives. In 1952, Lake Erie College, a women's college near Cleveland, inaugurated the practice of taking its entire junior class to Europe for the winter term. In 1958, the Conservatory of Music at Oberlin decided to send its entire third-year class to Salzburg for the full academic year. The Oberlin program encountered problems which later caused it to be terminated; the Lake Erie program still operates. In 1954, Tulane/Sophie Newcomb began to send a few students to each of several universities in England and in 1956, they sent small groups of students to Paris, Hamburg and Madrid. In 1955, Hollins College started a program which differed from others in that the group traveled to Paris at the end of the first semester of their sophomore year and remained in Europe for a full year, which included an extensive European tour during the summer months.

In the late 1950s, two programs began which proceeded from quite different assumptions. The first was the Antioch program; it attempted to transfer to Europe its unique curriculum with alternating periods of on-campus classes and an off-campus work experience. Both the academic component and the work experience were to be enriched by the experience of living in a foreign culture. Its principal academic site in France was in Besançon with students acquiring work experience in differenct locations throughout France. A unique approach was adopted by Stanford which attempted to transplant to the foreign site its own academic operation. Groups of Stanford students were sent abroad for two quarters and lived together at somewhat secluded locations with several professors from the home campus who provided most of the instruction. The first site opened near Stuttgart in 1958, and centers were inaugurated in Florence and in Tours in 1960, and in England -- at the former estate of Lady Astor -- in 1966. A more traditional type of program was operated in Hamburg from 1961 to 1971, and in later years there was a reorientation of the program which caused the closing of the centers near Stuttgart and in England.

In the later 1950s, the U.S. State Department, through its Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, gave an important endorsement to the concept of overseas undergraduate study. In 1959, it was interested in improving contacts with Latin America, and it offered financial assistance to help several universities to set up study abroad programs there. Indiana set up the first program in Lima, Peru, in 1959; the University of Kansas established a program in San José, Costa Rica; and Colgate University had a program in Mendoza, Argentina. A program was set up in Brazil which was discontinued after a few years, and the program in Argentina was also discontinued.

The Bureau, (recently transferred to USIA), has continued to support a variety of study abroad programs -- primarily for language training -- in Japan, Taiwan, the U.S.S.R., Brazil, and more recently, China. This assistance has been helpful in encouraging universities to expand their activities to non-European countries.

PART II: THE ISSUES IN STUDY ABROAD

By the end of the 1950s, it became apparent to many educators that the scattered experiments with differing types of study abroad programs represented a new educational approach with significant promise for the enrichment of undergraduate education.

The National Conference on Study Abroad Programs

To a large degree, this point of view was legitimized by a conference that brought over 500 presidents, deans, language professors and study abroad administrators to Chicago in October 1960. The National Conference on Study Abroad Programs was sponsored by four organizations: The Association of American Colleges, the Council on Student Travel,* the Experiment in International Living and the Institute of International Education, and supported by the Ford Foundation, the Danforth Foundation, the Hazen Foundation and the Corning Glass Foundation. The principal speakers included Jacques Courvoisier, rector of the University of Geneva; Samuel Gould, chancellor of the University of California at Santa Barbara; K.C. Saiyidan of the Ministry of Education of India and Richard Gettell, president of Mount Holyoke and chairman of the Commission on International Understanding of the AAC (IIE, 1961).

To a considerable extent, the major addresses consisted of cautions about the growth of the programs. There were cautions that students must not go "as university tourists," (Professor Courvoisier), that "at a somewhat immature age, students are more likely to be swept away by the impact of an entirely new experience....which may dazzle the eyes without necessarily illuminating the mind," (Professor Saiyidan), and "uncritical expansion of foreign study can lead to nothing short of disaster" (President Gettell). There was frequent reference to the dangers of "proliferation" of programs abroad and to the negative impression of the United States which Europeans would receive from an encounter with poorly prepared American students (IIE, 1961).

This was, however, not the major subject discussed in the workshops and in the corridors. Those who represented institutions already conducting programs reported on the excitement the new programs had brought to their campuses and to the ecstatic responses of most of the students who had participated. Those who wished to start programs were busy getting information about potential sites and contacts at potential host universities.

The lessons of the Chicago conference were outlined by Dr. Stephen Freeman, vice president of Middlebury College, dean of its language learning schools, and a highly respected authority in language learning and foreign study. In the conference summary, he outlined twelve findings of the meeting:

1. There must be a clear statement of academic objectives relevant to the objectives of the home institution.

2. There must be a careful preparation of a curriculum designed to achieve these objectives.

---

*The name of the Council on Student Travel was changed to the Council on International Educational Exchange in 1966. It is usually referred to just as "Council" in the rest of this paper.

3. There should be cooperation among American colleges to avoid duplication of programs.

4. There should be a clearinghouse of information about programs abroad.

5. There must be careful selection and preparation of students.

6. Part of the preparation must be the acquisition of an adequate knowledge of the language.

7. Immersion in the culture of the host country to the extent possible is an essential part of any program.

8. While underclassmen may benefit from study abroad, arrangements are difficult, and the experience is more valuable if postponed until the junior year or as part of graduate study.

9. Achievement of substantial credit toward the A.B. degree is essential.

10. The careful selection of a director is of major importance.

11. Costs must be low and scholarships available to avoid limiting the programs to those with greater financial means.

12. There must be evaluation of the results for the student, the institution and for the nation (IIE, 1961).

These twelve points, (with the addition of the problems of creating programs in non-European areas), formed the agenda for a large number of meetings throughout the 1960s and the outlines of the study abroad efforts of American higher education for the next two decades. Four years later, three of the four sponsors of the Chicago meeting, the Experiment, IIE and the Council, organized three regional seminars for college deans. Held in New York, at the Wingspread Conference Center in Racine, Wisconsin, and in San Francisco, the meetings reviewed and refined the findings of the Chicago meeting.

Other Meetings

These topics were also prominently included in the agendas of national conferences and regional meetings convened by the Council and the Institute throughout the 1960s. Several workshops were sponsored by the Council and the National Association of Foreign Student Advisors.* The Council convened special meetings in Bogotá, Columbia, in 1962 and in Tokyo in 1966 to assist in the development of programs in Latin America and in Japan. Beginning about 1960, the Council also organized periodic meetings of the resident directors of American programs in Europe on a national basis. Directors of programs in France first met in May of 1960. German program directors gathered for the first time in Heidelberg in February of 1962; Italian program directors met in Rome in May 1963; Madrid was the site of the first meeting of program directors in Spain in January of 1966, and British program directors gathered at about the same time. Directors of programs in Switzerland and Austria also met on several occasions.

*Now the National Assocation for Foreign Student Affairs (NAFSA).

These meetings usually included some representatives of the host or potential host institutions and frequently were visited by administrators from the home campus. They focused on practical problems of program operation and were useful in developing solutions to the complicated problems which directors faced in relating to host institutions, to their home institutions, to host government and, not the least complicated, to the students' landladies. The Council also sponsored four meeting at which directors from European countries met together with representatives from European universities and from the home institutions in the United States. The first meeting of European directors convened in Aix in 1964. In 1965, a large conference was held in Cannes which included those interested in study abroad programs along with European and American administrators of other types of exchange programs. A third meeting was held in Florence in 1967 and a fourth in Palma de Majorca in 1970. No Europe-wide meeting has been held since then, but directors have continued to meet regularly in France, England, Spain, Germany and occasionally in Italy. A similar group was organized in Japan and met irregularly throughout the 1960s and 1970s. These activities of the Council largely grew out of the work of its Committee on Academic Programs Abroad which was organized in 1958. The Committee's membership represented, for the most part, those universities which had entered the study abroad field in the 1950s. The Council on the Junior Year Abroad, which had represented the institutions sponsoring the more traditional junior year abroad programs, discontinued its meetings after 1963.

Another forum for communication among study abroad programs was the shipboard ambience aboard the M/S Aurelia, a chartered ship which the Council operated as a transatlantic student ship in the summers throughout the 1960s. Its late summer sailings to Europe were only lightly used by student tourists on summer vacations and the Council offered special rates and other assistance to study abroad groups traveling on these sailings. On its sailings in mid-August and early September, the ship frequently carried 600-700 study abroad program participants from 20 to 25 institutions along with other American and European students and professors. An intensive shipboard orientation program included language classes, discussions of current European cultural and political issues and exposure to European films and to the art collections of the European museums. The informal exchange of information between the American and European students on board, and between the directors accompanying the students, was probably even more helpful than the learning that took place in the scheduled sessions.

The Questions Debated

By the mid-1960s, the many discussions of study abroad at these meetings had produced a rough consensus as to what an overseas program ought to be like. In most respects, this consensus conformed to the judgments that had been proclaimed by Dr. Freeman at the 1960 conference in Chicago. However, most institutions that created programs departed from certain aspects of this consensus.

The most regularly flouted caution was the concern about the evils of "proliferation;" the schools already operating programs felt that the arrival of American student groups at their host universities would dilute their contacts with the local community and complicate their relationship with local university officials. While there had been only about ten programs in Europe in 1950 and about thirty in 1960, more than 100 new programs opened in Europe during the 1960s. The 1960s were a period of explosive growth in America's student population; universities were expanding rapidly, and the establishment of

branches overseas appealed both to administration and to students. Proliferation ensued.

The second of Dr. Freeman's judgments which was brought into question was his suggestion that programs should admit mainly upperclassmen and graduate students. Some institutions found that sophomores and even freshmen could benefit from a period of study abroad and that these underclassmen sometimes had more of the curricular flexibility needed if one were to be absent from the home campus for a semester or a year. Stanford's program established a precedent for programs for sophomores and other schools followed suit.

There was also disagreement about language prerequisites and the related questions as to whether English was to be the language of instruction in some of the classes. The purists argued that students should be fully competent in the language of the host country before they went abroad and that they should enroll only in the regular classes which the host university offered for its own students. The programs set up by the University of California and the City University of New York generally followed this pattern although tutorial assistance was provided in order to assist students who might be having difficulties with the language or with the pedagogical approach. The Stanford programs were thought to be at the other extreme. Except for language classes, most of the courses in the Stanford programs were taught by professors from the home campus -- in English, of course. Other programs used some of the regular sources of the host university and provided special courses set up by the host university or by the program itself, some of which could be taught in English.

Apart from language considerations, there was considerable debate about special courses. They were helpful to the student who wished to pursue his academic work without adapting to the very different teaching methods in the regular courses of the host university. These special courses -- and the grades issued -- resembled more closely courses taught on the home campus, thus making it simpler for a registrar to record the course credit on the student's transcript.

However, resorting to special courses or arranging courses completely independent of any host institution tended to reduce the student's involvement in a university community and his contact with the local students and the host culture. Since cultural immersion was considered a major factor in the learning experience in a study abroad program, some programs attempted to avoid them when possible.

Adjustment to the Foreign University

For many of the programs, the reliance on special courses rather than the regular courses of the host university was necessary because they would not have been able to recruit many students for their programs had they been limited to those with sufficient language skills to succeed in lecture courses intended for native-speaking students. But an additional barrier was created by the administrative difficulties involved in enrolling American students in regular courses in a European university. The most candid and concise description of these problems can be found in Dr. Freeman's history of the Middlebury Language Schools:

> A course in the Faculté de Lettres announced as 17th Century Literature might turn out to be a series of ten lectures on one act of Molière's Amphitryon. The professor might give no assignments at all, or might

> suggest a bibliography of fifty books. No quizzes, no check-ups, no conferences; then at the end of the year, an examination of unannounced content which seemed to the student to have little connection with the lectures or with the reading he had done. He tended to sign up for too many courses because the content was vague; he procrastinated because no one prodded him; he cried unfair when no one told him what he would be examined on; . . . Our Director of Studies was constantly faced with the task of initiating our students into a different educational philosophy, and showing them that this was why they were in France. . . . For the Director, the intricacies and inefficiencies of the French system were something else again. . . . For (some) parts of the university, it was impossible to know in advance what instruction would be offered. Our Middlebury bulletin attempted only a rash guess. As late as November 15, courses at the Faculté de Lettres would be announced for the following day by a slip on the bulletin board, or cancelled just as nonchalantly. Classrooms and hours would be announced and then changed, making conflicts in schedules (Freeman 1975, 229).

The above description applied to an experience in the University of Paris in the 1950s. Some of these conditions improved as French universities became better organized. But in later years resident directors still struggled with the different approach to university organization. One director reported that he had made a catalog of all the bulletin boards on which classes could be announced and assigned each of his American students to check several bulletin boards daily at the beginning of the year to report new class notices. From this he could assemble a useful summary of the classes that would be offered that year; one major problem was that native French students besieged his office when they discovered he had the only available comprehensive schedule of classes.

Universities in other countries presented different, but equally confusing, problems. The German academic year posed great problems because the first semester ran from November to March, and the second semester from May until mid-July. Directors in some Latin American countries reported that nearly all of the professors had full-time employment at other professional jobs and showed up at their evening lectures quite irregularly. This was not a great concern for many of the local students since they also worked full time and were frequently unable to attend classes. To solve this problem the student organization had collected from each professor a full set of notes on the lectures he intended to give and sold them to all enrolled students; under an agreement worked out by the student organization, all questions in the final examination had to be based on the materials in the notes as distributed.

The Problem of Cultural Immersion

The concern about maintaining contact with the local culture also affected the decision about student housing. Should students be housed in student housing, in apartments, in hotels or with private families? The debate ended in no uniform solution. Student housing at European universities turned out to be very different from the American dormitories; students lived in single rooms, and there was little social life among dormitory residents. Apartments or pensions usually did not facilitate local contacts. Family placement too often meant merely renting a room from a widowed landlady.

Whatever the choice in classes or housing, it took careful monitoring of the arrangements to assure that they provided the less adventurous student with the

most helpful opportunity to get acquainted with his/her neighboring residents in a foreign city. Program features such as the work experience in the Antioch program and the family living experience in the programs arranged by the Experiment in International Living constituted a major commitment to this aspect of the program. Many other programs built into their schedules special activities intended to foster student involvement in the local community.

These concerns became more critical as the number of Americans on the local university scene increased either through the growth in study abroad programs or in the presence of individual American students. There were far fewer Americans present in earlier days to tempt participants in the early junior year abroad programs to spend their time with other American students rather than with European friends. The arrangements for their classes were also helpful. Students who arrived in these programs may have taken a few special classes in composition or phonetics, arranged by the program, but otherwise they were relatively free to enroll in a wide variety of courses in a number of different parts of the university.

There were seldom other American students in these classes; it was difficult to assign comparable American credits to many of these courses, but at least the students were sitting next to European students rather than next to American colleagues. For a variety of reasons, it gradually became more difficult to arrange individualized schedules for students. Administrators at universities starting new programs were frequently concerned with required credits in majors and minors, the number of contact hours in each course, and "distribution" requirements. Students were eager to enroll in courses where they could maintain their grade point averages. Many of these problems were solved only through the ingenuity of a busy resident director or a cooperative registrar or dean at the home campus.

PART III: THE "PROLIFERATION" OF STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS

Beginning about 1960, the involvement of colleges and universities in study abroad began to operate on a different scale. Most of the earlier programs consisted of one or two centers to which the school sent a few of their own students and perhaps a few from somewhat similar institutions. Most of these programs were intended for language majors, and the enrollments were primarily female. Most programs were sponsored by private Eastern colleges or by Catholic institutions with European ties. The new patterns were very different.

For the first time, large private and public universities began to envision an extensive network of overseas centers which would provide an overseas opportunity for a significant percentage of their students. Harlan Cleveland, dean of the Maxwell School at Syracuse University, expressed this point of view when he argued that study abroad should be a "live option" for any undergraduate student. He felt that the opportunity should be open even to the less well prepared student; putting it more colorfully, he said, "A year of Podunk in Peru may be a better educational gamble than a year of Podunk in Podunk" (Cleveland, 1960). Following his lead, Syracuse launched its own study abroad activities with centers that opened in Florence in 1959, in Madrid in 1961 and in Strasbourg in 1965. All together, the 82 universities providing data for the Program Survey sponsored 37 programs in 1960; by 1970 they had opened 165 additional overseas study centers.

The Programs of Large Universities

Like Syracuse, the institutions that now took the lead in study abroad programing were not in Podunk. Stanford was the first top-ranking university to make a commitment to provide an overseas study opportunity for a significant portion of its student body. We have already noted the centers it opened in France and in Italy by 1960. Stanford also opened more traditional programs in Germany and in France in the 1960s. In the 1970s, following a major faculty review, it either closed or revised the approach in the original large centers. More recently, Stanford has added programs in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The University of California was the major university with a commitment to an extensive overseas program. Undoubtedly, the Stanford example encouraged California to consider this possibility, but of equal importance was the arrival of Samuel Gould as the chancellor of the new UC campus at Santa Barbara. Gould as president at Antioch had been an innovator of overseas programs, and President Clark Kerr had authorized him to make Santa Barbara a center for international programs of the University of California. In 1963, California opened its first center in Bordeaux, and it added centers in Göttingen and in Padua in 1963, in Madrid and Tokyo in 1964 and in London, Bogotá and Hong Kong in 1965. In subsequent years California added several centers in France and started new programs in Asia, Africa and Latin America and in other European countries. The California programs more nearly followed the traditional junior year abroad programs in their academic arrangements; the centers were all supervised by California faculty members, but the courses were all provided by the host university and were normally courses offered regularly for their own students. A high degree of language competence was required and the program, although administered at the University of California at Santa Barbara, operated under the supervision of a committee of the state-wide faculty senate and enrolled students from all UC campuses (University of California, 1982).

The expansive commitment of the University of California, added to that of Stanford, encouraged a number of additional universities to look seriously at study abroad as a potential addition to their curricular offerings. Understandably, one of the first was the California State College and University System. Using a program pattern similar to that of the University of California, the CSCU program, based at San Francisco State College, established centers in France and Germany in 1963, in Spain, Japan and Sweden in 1964 and in Italy in 1966. Later programs were established in Denmark, Great Britain, Israel, Mexico, New Zealand and Taiwan. The City University of New York began to set up a similar series of centers and soon operated programs in the major European countries and Israel. CUNY had some unique problems since it had a tradition of charging no tuition -- a politically sensitive issue with the faculty. It also had a tradition of service to students without financial resources and needed to keep costs to a minimum. With considerable ingenuity, heavy subsidies were secured from university funds and from governmental and private sources; with the budget cuts of the mid-1970s, it became difficult to fund the program, and it was discontinued.

The next large program to be created was at the State University of New York. Chancellor Samuel Gould, who had nursed the Antioch and California programs into operation, left California in 1962 to become chancellor of the State University of New York -- a huge educational conglomerate with more than 60 campuses. Within a few years he had implemented an expansive plan for a previously approved center for international programs at SUNY. A special campus was set up at Planting Fields on Long Island in 1965 to develop and coordinate the programs. The programs were to be operated by the various four-year campuses of the university, but programs would be open to students from the entire university system. There was more flexibility in the academic pattern of the SUNY programs than in the CUNY and the California programs which were all operated by a single central office. Within a few years, financial and administrative problems within SUNY led to the abandonment of some aspects of the projected international program. The facility at Planting Fields was converted to other uses and the international program office moved to Albany, where it undertook to coordinate programs rather than administer them. The various campuses continued to develop overseas programs and by 1973, there were 800 students in England (7 programs); France (6 programs); Italy and Spain (3 programs); Israel (2 programs); and Canada, Denmark, Germany, Puerto Rico and Switzerland (1 program each) (Ward, 1985).

The only Ivy League university to make a substantial commitment to study abroad was Dartmouth, which had a full fall quarter program at Salamanca as early as 1958 and in the late 1960s began to operate quarter session programs in Toulouse, Berlin and Florence. In the late 1970s, Dartmouth developed some special language programs in France, Germany, Italy, Spain and Mexico which were closely related to the special emphasis Dartmouth has given to language learning.

A number of other universities made substantial commitments to study abroad programs in the 1960s. In addition to its Lima program, Indiana University started programs in Strasbourg, Hamburg, Bologna and Madrid. Pennsylvania State University started programs in Strasbourg, Cologne and Salamanca. Colorado opened centers in Bordeaux, Lancaster and Regensburg. Brigham Young University had programs in Madrid and Salzburg, Rutgers in Tours and Florence, and Tufts in London and Tübingen. New York University established a very large program in cooperation with the University of Madrid in 1967 and later set up a somewhat similar program in Paris.

These programs were all very similar in their organizational pattern. Students were located at foreign universities, took a few regular courses at the host university and were mostly enrolled in special courses arranged in some cooperative pattern by the host university and the U.S. institution. Most of the students were from the sponsoring institution and they were accompanied by a resident director appointed by the home institution.

The Programs of Private Colleges

Very substantial commitments to study abroad were also made during the 1960s by a number of private colleges. The most interesting programs were initiated by Kalamazoo, Beloit, Goshen and Friends World College. All of these programs were closely related to basic revisions in the curriculum on the home campus; several were the beneficiaries of special funding. The Kalamazoo program provided that essentially all of the Kalamazoo students would spend two quarters of their undergraduate days studying in a foreign country. It placed the students in small groups at a wide variety of foreign universities under the supervision of local administrators -- usually on the university staff -- who were under contract with the College to supervise and advise the Kalamazoo students and to arrange special classes as needed. Starting with groups in France, Germany, Spain and Sierra Leone in 1962, the program has grown to 15 locations in Europe and Africa. The Beloit program was based on one-quarter seminars in various countries led by Beloit faculty and involved a smaller proportion of the Beloit student body.

The Friends World College curriculum was established in 1968 and included a plan whereby each student would spend a few months in each of several overseas locations. These included England and Japan, but the main emphasis was on Third World locations in Kenya, India, Mexico and Costa Rica. Activities in these areas were frequently related to human service activities in the area which were sponsored by various Quaker organizations. Beginning in 1968, the Goshen program had an even more clearly defined social service emphasis; most Goshen students must spend one semester in a Third World area and work part of the time in a community service project -- frequently related to Mennonite sponsored service programs. The service project is supplemented by locally arranged instruction which focuses on language classes and study of the local society.

The commitment of these institutions to their special approaches to study abroad is not limited to these programs; all are also involved in arrangements whereby their students can participate in other programs which their universities sponsor in cooperation with other institutions. Kalamazoo is a member of the Great Lakes Colleges Association (GLCA) which cooperatively established programs in Beirut, Tokyo, India and in Scotland as early as 1964; Antioch, Earlham and Wooster served as the administrative arms of GLCA in setting up these early programs. The Associated Colleges of the Midwest, of which Beloit was a member, established a program in marine biology in Costa Rica as early as 1963 and in 1969 began to cooperate with the University of Wisconsin in a program in India.

Goshen College also participated with several other colleges related to the Mennonite Church and cooperated with a consortium of five colleges related to the Church of the Brethren, which started programs in Strasbourg, Marburg and Barcelona in 1962, 1963 and 1972, respectively. Central College established programs in Paris, Vienna and Madrid in 1965, 1966 and 1968, respectively, which enrolled students from a number of institutions.

In addition to these programs, there were a large number of colleges or universities which had, by 1970, established one or two programs. These frequently represented the initiative of a language department rather than a university-wide commitment to study abroad. The programs, nevertheless, usually enrolled students from a number of disciplines and provided a variety of academic options in the overseas curriculum.

The End of the Sixties

By 1970, there were few critics who challenged the assumptions of the study abroad programs. Most of the cautionary reservations expressed as late as 1960 were seldom heard. No one suggested, as they had in the 1950s, that unprepared American students would make a bad impression abroad and endanger international cooperation; study abroad participants were a small portion of the tide of American tourists invading every European country -- to the delight of the tourist authorities. There was also less concern about the effect a deluge of American students might have on a foreign university. Programs in a few locations "proliferated" -- Madrid, Paris, Florence -- but they affiliated with a variety of educational institutions, (or operated apart from any local institution), and they seldom endangered the university relationships of existing programs. Many provincial universities welcomed American institutions which wished to establish programs. Several universities in England and Japan actually addressed letters to many American colleges inviting them to send American students; some were motivated by a desire to make their own student bodies more international while others were seeking affiliation with American institutions for a variety of other reasons.

The selection of students became a matter of somewhat less concern. Psychological tests were found to have little utility in predicting success in a foreign setting; as students came to understand the foreign programs, self-selection, faculty recommendations and a review of grade point averages seemed to be effective mechanisms for selecting participants. Programs where instruction was offered in a foreign language continued to require language competence, and new techniques and special tests were developed to verify linguistic skills. A number of programs developed where little prior knowledge of the language was required. There can be little doubt that, by 1970, study abroad programs were an accepted feature of an undergraduate education.

PART IV: THE SEVENTIES: NEW PATTERNS FOR STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS

The period of most rapid increase in the number of study abroad programs extended from about 1962 to 1975. After 1970, some of the programs that were created in response to the enthusiasm for study abroad which characterized the late 1960s were discontinued. The annual increase in the number of new programs after 1975 was only about half the number that it had been in the previous ten years. In 1977, for instance, ten programs that had been operated by the City University of New York were all discontinued when the CUNY administration, due to the financial problems of New York City and New York State, cancelled funding for the office that administered the programs. For somewhat similar reasons, the University of Pittsburgh discontinued its European programs in the late 1970s. Numerous programs in Latin America which were started in the late 1960s did not continue beyond 1975.

In spite of these problems, there continued to be a steady, if less spectacular, increase in the number of institutions sponsoring programs and in the number of programs in Europe and in non-European areas. The 82 institutions whose reports were used in the Program Survey created 165 new overseas centers in the 1960s and 145 in the 1970s. In the first four years of the 1980s, they opened 48 new centers (Appendix, Chart I).

Since most of the programs have increased their enrollments over the years, total student enrollment has also grown. It is difficult to demonstrate this fact; the surveys carried out by IIE changed their basis for collecting statistics in 1978 and show only modest increases since then. However, the statistics which a number of institutions have submitted on their programs confirm this trend. By 1982-83, the IIE survey records that over 30,000 students were studying overseas in programs sponsored by U.S. colleges and universities (IIE, 1984). Since a very substantial number of American students study overseas in programs that are not directly sponsored by a U.S. college or university and a number of smaller exchanges are probably unreported, the number for that year is probably 10,000 higher and by 1984 may have increased to about 50,000 students.

More than half of the new programs reported since 1980 have been organized by institutions that already operate a number of centers and are expanding into new areas to provide linguistic or area study opportunities which had not been available in existing programs. A few additional small colleges or large universities have in each year inaugurated their first study abroad programs. Another significant aspect of the increase in programs since 1970 is the increase in opportunities for study abroad in programs which are not sponsored by the student's own institution.

These outside programs now represent an increasing factor in the study abroad field. Under the simplest of arrangements, an institution arranges to place its students in a program administered by another college or university. This pattern goes back to the first study abroad program, the University of Delaware program in Paris. By its tenth year of operation, the Delaware program was enrolling students from thirty other institutions. Many institutions have felt more satisfied with arrangements where they have some input into the policy and operational decisions affecting any programs to which they send numbers of their students and, for this reason, have preferred more formal forms of cooperation with other schools in study abroad undertakings.

Cooperative and Consortia Programs

Frequently, two or three programs which were geographically adjacent or shared other interests have cooperatively sponsored overseas programs. Wisconsin and Michigan jointly sponsored an early study abroad program at the University of Aix-Marseilles and joined with Wayne State University in sponsoring Wayne's second German program at Freiburg. Stetson University's early programs in Madrid and Freiburg were jointly sponsored with three neighboring Florida colleges.

Larger groups of institutions formed more formal consortia in order to facilitate the academic, operational and financial responsibilities of their programs. A consortium in the Northwest based at the University of Washington started a program in London in 1962 and added a center in Avignon in 1970. Several groups of colleges affiliated with religious denominations formed formal consortia -- the Church of the Brethren Colleges, the Mennonite Colleges, the Seventh Day Adventist Colleges and several groups of Catholic colleges. Other cooperative programs grew out of college consortia that were formed for somewhat broader purposes such as the Great Lakes Colleges Association and the Associated Colleges of the Midwest.

Several consortia developed within the membership of the Concil on International Educational Exchange. In 1970, a CIEE consortium organized a semester program in Leningrad which was the first study abroad program in the Soviet Union. Another consortium developed several undergraduate study centers in France and Spain. Other groups of CIEE members sponsored one of the first study abroad programs in China in 1981 at Beijing University and at Fudan University in Shanghai. Consortia sponsoring language programs in Japan and Taiwan were organized with an administrative base at Stanford University.

Independent Foreign and Proprietary Programs

Other study abroad programs were set up by educational organizations which were independent of academic institutions. The earliest was the Experiment in International Living, which had assisted in the establishment of the study abroad programs of a number of colleges and universities by providing overseas administrative services and arranging home hospitality for the students. Beginning in 1963, the Experiment began a series of programs involving small numbers of students in programs emphasizing language, independent research and learning through living with families in local communities. These programs later became more closely related to the Experiment's School for International Training.

A number of European universities organized their own special programs for American students. One of the earliest was the University of Stockholm which offered a year-long program. In Copenhagen, the Danish International Student Committee organized a program at the University of Copenhagen in 1962 with all the instruction in English. The program was represented in the United States by Whittier College and Washburn University and has enrolled several hundred students annually. The University of Paris had a special course for foreign students -- the Cours de Civilisation -- as early as 1923 when the first University of Delaware junior year group used it for some of its courses. Most of the French universities set up special institutes or courses for non-French students; many of them have provided courses for study abroad groups and at some periods they also allowed direct enrollment opportunities for American students. A few British universities set up special courses for American students, and most

British and most Spanish, Italian and German universities allowed American students to enroll directly for their regular courses and have provided special classes for study abroad groups under special agreements.

Some organizations have been created solely for the purpose of operating overseas study centers. One of the earliest was the Institute of European Studies which established its first center in Vienna in 1959 and later established programs in Paris and Nantes in France and in Madrid and Freiburg. Another was the Institute of American Universities which established a center in Aix in 1960 and later added several other locations in southern France. In recent years, a number of programs have been set up in England, France and Spain with no relation to any American or European university; some of them are clearly commercial and others have only an ambiguous claim to non-profit status.

One-to-One Reciprocal Programs

A number of universities are also engaged in direct reciprocal exchanges in which a small number of students are exchanged under an informal arrangement providing for reciprocal remission of fees. These exchanges frequently have been in existence for 20 to 30 years and pre-date the more formal study abroad programs. They were frequently arranged and administered by language departments on a quite informal basis. Of the 82 institutional reports tabulated in our survey, 30 institutions reported a total of 75 agreements involving about 200 students. Seventeen of these agreements were with German universities, and there were smaller numbers of agreements with Japanese, British, French and Chinese universities in that order. These figures are undoubtedly too low since some of the institutional responses were received from central offices administering study abroad programs which indicated that they would not necessarily be aware of this type of exchange agreement.

Some universities have used reciprocal exchange agreements to establish substantial programs which place students in foreign institutions on an individually enrolled basis. The University of Massachusetts, for instance, had a traditional study abroad program at the University of Freiburg in Germany as early as 1964, but after 1970 its new program were mostly based on such agreements. At present, its most extensive arrangements are in the United Kingdom, but there are also agreements with a number of universities in Canada and Germany and with a few each in Argentina, Australia, China, Colombia, Ireland, Japan, Sweden and Switzerland. Most of the arrangements include provision for the reciprocal reception of student and/or faculty in the United States. By the 1980s, the programs enrolled about 250 students including new group programs in France and Italy.

In 1979, a special organization was set up to handle this type of program at the initiative of Georgetown University. Called the International Student Exchange Program (ISEP), it has received substantial financial support from the USIA and in 1982-83 handled exchange arrangements for 274 American and foreign students.

Community College Programs

The increasing involvement of community colleges in study abroad is another development of significance. The community college is the newest and fastest growing sector of U.S. higher education and has recently become involved in international programs. Its flexibility has made it an ideal institution to

provide the type of education needed by some foreign students and has enabled some colleges to provide a variety of short-term overseas experiences for their students and their communities. However, the community college population includes large numbers of students with lower income levels who can only afford to attend the community college because of the low tuition and the economy of living at home or working part time. These students find it difficult to participate in the type of semester or year-long study abroad programs discusssed here, and the colleges find it difficult to integrate such off-campus periods into some of their two-year curricula. Nevertheless, an increasing number of study abroad programs are being mounted by community colleges; Rockland Community College in Rockland County, New York, has pioneered this development and has developed ingenious ways in which to keep the costs of these programs within the financial abilities of its students. It has developed large programs in England and in Israel, and has made these available to over 100 other community colleges -- and some four-year institutions -- through a consortium it helped establish -- The College Consortium for International Study (Hess, 1982).

PART V: SOME EXAMPLES OF INSTITUTIONAL INVOLVEMENT

It is interesting to look at how these various opportunities for study abroad translate into the offerings on the different types of campuses which have gotten involved in study abroad more recently.

Gustavus Adolphus College

Gustavus Adolphus is a private college with several thousand students in St. Peter, Minnesota. It organized its first, and only, formal study abroad program in 1981 through an agreement with the University of Exeter in England to which each year it sends eight to ten students accompanied by a Gustavus Adolphus professor as a student advisor. In addition, it has reciprocal exchange agreements with two universities in Sweden and an agreement with Tübingen University in Germany under which eight students go abroad and a similar number of students come to Minnesota.

But, Gustavus Adolphus also offers its students a wide range of other opportunities. Through the Associated Colleges of the Midwest consortium, its student can enroll in programs in Costa Rica, India and Yugoslavia. Through the Beaver College consortium, they have access to a large number of programs in Great Britain. The College refers students to two programs in the U.S.S.R., the consortium program in Leningrad administered by CIEE and the program at the Pushkin Institute in Moscow operated by the American Council of Teachers of Russian. Gustavus Adolphus sends students to the DIS program at the University of Copenhagen and to an independent program in Greece, the College Year in Athens. Programs in urban studies in Scandinavia and in Colombia are open to students through the Higher Education Consortium for Urban Affairs.

Students may also enroll in several centers of the Institute of American Universities in southern France and the programs of the Institute of European Studies in five European countries. Students are also encouraged to enroll in Loyola University's program in Rome and St. Louis University's program in Madrid. Direct enrollment is also possible in programs offered by Haifa University in Israel, Ibero-Americana University in Mexico City, Cuttington College in Liberia and in a number of summer programs. The richness of the opportunities offered to Gustavus Adolphus students is indicative of the extensive catalog of offerings on many other campuses.

University of Pennsylvania

Another type of university involvement is seen at the University of Pennsylvania which started its only foreign study program in 1982 at King's College in London. It is also involved in a cooperative program at the University of Bologna and sends students to the NYU program in Madrid, Wayne State's program in Munich and Columbia's program in Paris. In addition, it has a reciprocal exchange for 15 to 20 students per year with the University of Edinburgh, and it sends a few students each year to the Technologicial Institute at the University of Compiègne in France, the International Christian University in Tokyo and to the University of Ibadan in Nigeria as part of a reciprocal exchange agreement. About 100 of Penn's students annually enroll in these programs.

Texas A & M University

A third type of institution would be Texas A & M University which also operates only one program -- a spring semester at Figline University in Italy for students of landscape architecture and environmental design. It also has reciprocal exchanges with the Monterey Institute of Technology in Mexico and Stirling University in Scotland. In addition, Texas A & M has a number of four- to six-week summer courses in Europe arranged by its Colleges of Business Administration, Engineering, Education, and Liberal Arts, and its Study Abroad Office which advises students on a variety of other opportunities for study abroad.

None of these three institutions is typical of all American institutions. It is clear, however, that institutions which do not operate large programs of study abroad, nevertheless, offer their students wide opportunities. There are few colleges or universities that do not offer some of these programs to their students.

PART VI: THE STUDENT POPULATION

There have been a few studies which, when compared, give us some insight into the backgrounds and experiences of the students in the programs and into the changes that may have occurred over the years. A study by C. Robert Pace of Syracuse University compared the Sweet Briar program participants of the 1950s with the University of Delaware participants of the 1930s. A University of Colorado study reports on students who were participants in their programs from the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s. A study by Hull, Lemke and Houang reports on participants in programs at several universities in the mid-1970s. A CIEE survey of participants in study abroad who purchased the International Student Identity Card in 1984 gives us an up-to-date analysis of some factors in participants' backgrounds. Although data was gathered in different ways, all of these studies dealt with relatively large numbers of participants, and they provide clues which support the following commonsense conclusions about study abroad participants. (Pace, 1959; Purkaple, 1979; Hull, 1978; Koester, 1985).

There is ample evidence that study abroad participants come from upper income groups. Pace reports that 42% of Delaware and 57% of Sweet Briar participants reported parents' income of "$10,000 or above." (This was apparently a measure of affluence in the 1930s and 1950s.)

Other clues to economic status are the findings of Hull and Koester, respectively, that about 50% of the participants in the 1970s and in 1984 had had prior travel experience to a foreign country. In the 1984 survey, 30% of the students came from homes where at least one of the parents had lived abroad for one year or more, and 33% from homes where one parent spoke a second language. For 70% of the 1984 students, personal savings and family support constituted the major sources of funding for the trip; loans and scholarships were a major source of only 25%.

Participants were originally nearly all juniors; about two-thirds were juniors in the 1970s and less than half in the 1980s. Only one-fourth of the participants in the 1930s were men and about one-third since 1950. Eighty-five percent in the 1930s were language majors, 54% in the 1950s, 50-66% in the 1970s but only 22% in 1984. The 1984 survey showed that 26% were in other "liberal arts," 14% in the social sciences, 10% in business, 9% in professional or pre-professional studies and 5% in engineering or the physical sciences.

Participants in study abroad programs reportedly return to the Unites States more critical of American foreign policy but more favorable toward the American culture -- except for the 1930s students who were very much disillusioned about all countries. Forty-five percent of the Colorado students reported that their foreign experience was useful in securing employment while 86% of the 1984 respondents expected their travel abroad to help them in finding a job. Participants were admitted to the programs only if they were making good grades; their grade point averages improved after they returned at about the same rate as those students who stayed at home. Most students scored positively on some measures of increase in understanding while abroad. Nearly all students said they were highly satisfied with their experience abroad -- 99% in the Colorado group.

This brief review of several studies can only suggest the very positive evaluation which most students place on their experiences in a study abroad program. Sixty-five percent of the respondents in the Hull study described the period abroad as "the best part" of their undergraduate education; other studies show similar or more positive evaluations.

PART VII: THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM

Study abroad programs normally list a fixed set of courses which make up the curriculum. In practice, however, the programs need to exercise considerable flexibility as to the courses being taught. Since most study abroad groups are rather small, enrollment in some courses may be so low as to require cancellation. Host universities may, for various reasons, be unable to offer courses which had been planned. On the other hand, conscientious resident directors may try to set up additional courses when students have special interests or need certain courses to fulfill academic requirements. These may necessitate employing teachers or finding local institutions which can provide the desired instruction.

Programs which are related to a host university may be offering three types of courses: regular courses which the host university offers to all of its students; special courses which the university provides for all foreign students -- or for all American students; special courses which the host university may have set up solely for a specific American program. In our Opinion Survey, the responding institutions reported that about half of their courses are classes which are specifically set up by the resident director for the program in cooperation with the host university. The second most common pattern is the use of regular classes of the host university. The least common pattern is the use of those special classes that are set up by the host university for all foreign students.

Development of the Course of Study

Most of the courses of the University of Delaware group in the 1920s and 1930s were taken at the Cours de Civilisation which consisted of special courses dealing with French literature, history, art, philosophy and economic and social development. Students also took courses in economics, political science and international relations at the Ecole Libre des Sciences Politiques. By the 1950s, the program -- now the Sweet Briar program -- offered the students courses at a number of additional institutions including the Ecole du Louvre, the Conservatoire National de Musique, the Institut Catholique, the Collèges de France and the Institut d'Ethnologie (Rogers, 1958; Matthew, 1973).

Institutions related to a European university usually provide their students with a preparatory period prior to the beginning of regular classes. This is intended to help in orientation and to hone language skills, but it is also necessary since most European univerisities do not begin classes until sometime in October -- well into the fall semester or quarter at an American college. The preparatory session in the Smith College program in the 1950s was held in Aix where the student boarded with private families and spent six weeks attending classes in French grammar, composition and phonetics taught by local teachers. Their program also included art lectures, visits to museums and excursions to places of interest (Garraty, 1959).

Most programs in the 1980s still include a preparatory period. In the Liberal Arts Program at the University of Seville, administered by CIEE for a consortium of U.S. universities, the preparatory program runs for four weeks. It includes several courses in grammar, composition and conversation for students in need of further work in these fields and courses in the art of Goya, in semantics, and in lexicology for more advanced students. The program in the two regular semesters in Seville lists twenty-seven courses especially arranged for the American students which include the usual courses in linguisitcs and literature and such

additional courses as Teaching English as a Second Language, Spanish for Business and Commerce, the Geography of Underdevelopment, the History of Modern Man, U.S. and Latin American Diplomatic History, and Political and Social Change.

The recent addition of study abroad programs designed for students in technical or pre-professional fields, such as business, architecture and engineering has posed special curricular problems. European institutions do not offer the type of technical courses that are provided at the undergraduate level in American universities. These programs have, therefore, usually been limited to more advanced students. Other schools have set up programs that are independent of any host university and have arranged special courses similar to those offered in the United States.

When employing faculty for special courses, some programs have limited the selection of teachers to those holding appointments by a European institution as a means of assuring academic competence or for legal reasons. Other courses have been taught by professors from the home campus or have been taught by individuals selected by and employed by their resident director. The schools in our Opinion Survey report that most of their instructors are provided by the host university, a smaller number are hired locally and the smallest number of courses are taught by faculty from the home campus. There appears to have been little change in this over the years. On the other hand, more than half of the resident directors are sent from the home campus. Persons employed locally are the second largest category and faculty of the host university represent a small percentage of the resident directors. There is a trend for an increasing number of the resident directors to be locally employed and for there to be a smaller percentage of resident directors sent from the home campus.

Most programs provide at least a supplementary library for the use of their students. This is partly because library facilities vary greatly from country to country. At the traditional European library, study facilities are limited; the collection is frequently inadequate and books cannot not be taken out for use. Conditions have been much improved in recent years, especially at the newer universities. There continues to be a need, however, for special program libraries to supply the references needed for the special courses the American programs offer. These are sometimes housed in a university library, but more frequently in the program office.

Nearly all programs arrange a number of field trips and excursions for their students. These are frequently related to courses in art, history, sociology, etc. Excursions with local students have also been useful in promoting contacts within the university's student body.

Sponsors of programs have long felt that the experience of living in a foreign culture provides a significant portion of the educational value of study abroad programs. Antioch, for instance, considers the off-campus work experience an integral part of the curriculum, just as it does on its home campus. At Goshen, community service in underdeveloped countries is regarded as a normal part of formal education. More recently, programs sponsored by Empire State College and Rockland Community College have used this concept in Israel and England. They have also attempted to formalize the procedures through which academic supervision and evaluation is provided. Further experiments of this nature will undoubtedly broaden the range of foreign experiences which can be considered part of the formal curriculum of study abroad programs.

Summer Programs

Most of the colleges and universities which sponsor academic year and semester study abroad programs also sponsor programs during the summer. Many institutions sponsored summer programs prior to establishing the overseas study centers for programs during the academic year. In some cases, the experience of administering summer programs led schools into programs during the academic year. They discovered that the academic year program was not much more costly for the student than the summer program; transportation and tuition costs were the same or less, living expenses were modest and the total was frequently less than a comparable period of study on the home campus.

Nevertheless, summer programs have continued to serve a very useful function. They have provided overseas study opportunities for many students whose program of study does not permit absence from the home campus for a full academic year or semester. This summer option has been particularly useful for students wishing to have some opportunity to study a foreign language in situ. Many summer language courses are offered by foreign universities, and many are sponsored by American colleges, universities and non-academic agencies.

Summer programs also provide an opportunity for non-academic educational programs that colleges are not able to include as part of the curriculum for which regular academic credit is awarded. An interesting example is the summer program sponsored by Operation Crossroads Africa which gives students an in-depth experience in African countries where it would be difficult to arrange a more formal study program. The homestay programs which have been arranged for many years by the Experiment in International Living are another example. A work abroad program administered by the Council on International Educational Exchange provides another educationally valuable summer experience that would not normally receive credit from a registrar. As noted above, some institutions have been incorporating experiences of this type into their study abroad programs for some years and are beginning to develop methods of assessing them for purposes of granting academic credit.

It may be helpful to explain the decision to exclude from this paper a more extensive study of overseas summer programs. Narrowing the scope of this paper was useful, of course, in reducing the data that needed to be collected and reported. It also enabled this study to focus more sharply on those educational programs which clearly are being substituted for an equivalent period of instruction on the home campus; most summer programs do not meet this definition. Reliable data on summer programs is also difficult to collect since they frequently are operated on an occasional basis or discontinued after a few years.

PART VIII: THE EVALUATION OF STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS

Recognizing the Need

The educational quality of study abroad programs has always been suspect. It was self-evident that many of the procedures intended to insure educational standards at the American campus could not very well be duplicated at a foreign university which was operated in a very different way. Library facilities were minimal, the approach to testing and grading was very different, and the classroom procedures were strange to the American student. Above all, the students were thousands of miles beyond the ken of their academic authorities; how could deans be sure that their students were sticking to their books instead of sampling the myriad pleasures of life in Paris, Florence or Madrid?

Directors and administrators of the early programs frequently found it difficult to persuade registrars to allow full credit for their courses, and administrative committees were reluctant to accept that courses taught abroad could satisfy requirements for advanced study or graduation. With difficulty, directors persuaded European professors to give their students American-style examinations and some directors were forced to invent complicated systems for converting European grades on a scale of 1 to 10 into American A's, B's and C's.

The earliest concerns for evaluation or accreditation arose because directors and administrators perceived a need for some outside agency to certify that their programs were solving these perplexing problems in an educationally satisfactory way. They needed some authority to help them defend the assumptions of the study abroad program -- that study abroad programs were an acceptable equivalent of education on the home campus and that the benefits of an educational sojourn in a foreign culture outweighed any failures of the instruction to conform to traditional American methods.

Directors also saw other needs for outside authority. The reputations in their own programs were endangered by laxness in the programs of other institutions. The presence of any American students in Paris who spent an undue portion of their time in sidewalk cafes tended to reflect on the quality of all the study abroad programs in the city. Rumors of such sybaritic behavior dogged directors' efforts to give assurances to the deans at home that their students were studying assiduously.

More often lapses in the operation of one program complicated relations with the host university for other programs at the same location. Such situations were not uncommon; there were program administrators who were more noted for their promotional ability than for their insight into the educational systems of the host countries. They sometimes sent students who were unprepared for the courses which had been arranged or they selected directors who lacked a sound knowledge of the host culture, or even of its language. A few institutions were either inept or unscrupulous in their negotiations with host institutions. Directors hoped that the existence of some outside evaluative procedure could induce sponsoring institutions to provide more responsible oversight to their overseas ventures.

Approaches to the Evaluation of Study Abroad Programs

The first approaches to the problem were made by organizations mainly composed of administrators and directors of study abroad programs. A 1955 document reports

that the Council on the Junior Year Abroad had, by that time, drawn up some guidelines which institutions administering study abroad programs should observe. Recognizing its lack of authority, the Council termed its guidelines "non-obligatory."

A few years later, the newly formed Committee on Academic Programs Abroad of CIEE made an extensive study of the problem. The Committee decided that the first responsibility for evaluating an overseas program lay with the sponsoring institution; to this end the Committee drew up and published "A Guide to the Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programs Abroad" (CIEE, 1963).

The format of the guide reflected evaluative instruments then being used by the regional agencies which accredited colleges and universities; it set forth statements of principle in twelve areas (curriculum, selection of participants, qualifications of directors, etc.) and listed questions that each institution should be asking about the quality of its programs in these areas.

Committee members also conferred with the various accreditation agencies and encouraged them to include a review of each institution's study abroad programs as a part of the regular ten year review of that institution's accreditation. Most of the regional agencies included the Committee's new guide in the list of documents to which institutions could refer as they prepared the report for reaccreditation. Several also decided that on-site visits to overseas centers should be made by one or more members of the accreditation team.

On the recommendation of the Committee, CIEE also agreed to administer a service which arranged for teams of experienced administrators to visit overseas programs and conduct evaluations on behalf of the sponsoring institutions. Four separate teams, each with four or five members, were sent to Europe in the period from 1972-1977. The teams visited France, England, Germany and Spain; each team spent two or three days visiting each of the four programs they reviewed. An extensive report was compiled by the sponsoring institution prior to each team's visit abroad and the team wrote a full report for the sponsoring institution. This project has been described in a paper written by Francis Heller and Irwin Abrams, who participated in the evaluation teams (Heller, Abrams, Evaluating Academic Programs Abroad: The CIEE Project). Additional evaluation teams were not sent abroad after 1977 due to the increasing cost of travel and of the administrative work involved in setting up the visits. Another factor was the increasing involvement of the regional accrediting agencies in sending teams to visit overseas centers.

In 1967, the accrediting agencies acting through their central organization, The Federation of Regional Accrediting Agencies' Commissions for Higher Education (FRACHE), adopted a brief statement of principles that should guide institutions setting up study abroad programs. Its principles were similar to those set forth in CIEE's Guide although it gave less emphasis to the value of the student's encounter with the foreign culture. Somewhat amended, the FRACHE statement is still used in a slightly different form by each of the regional accrediting agencies. Greater emphasis was also placed on visits to the overseas centers by outside evaluators from the accrediting agencies; this was part of a movement to provide fuller oversight of all of the off-campus instructional programs of colleges and universities.

There were other efforts to provide systematic outside evaluations of study abroad programs. The Organization of Directors of Programs in Spain became concerned about the quality of programs there, primarily because a number of programs shared some classes at the University of Madrid. A system was set up whereby teams of the directors in Spain reviewed and evaluated each other's programs. The practice has continued until the present. A somewhat broader review was undertaken by the American Association of Teachers of Spanish and Portuguese (AATSP). The Association dispatched evaluators to visit a large number of both academic year and summer programs in Spain and in Mexico. The project was primarily prompted by the problems Spanish teachers faced in recommending programs to which their students could best go for short-term in situ language courses. The number of such courses had grown rapidly, especially in Mexico, and many of them were of indifferent quality.

Another interesting approach was followed by a committee of NAFSA working in cooperation with the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers (AAACRO). The NAFSA project was intended to provide guidance to advisors and registrars who faced difficult problems in assigning academic credit to students returning from study abroad.

Problems did not arise when the students had been enrolled in programs that were sponsored by colleges accredited in the United States where the normal procedures for transferring academic credit from one American institution to another would apply. The difficulty arose when the students had been studying in programs sponsored by foreign institutions or by non-academic American institutions, among which were some of questionable standards. The procedure involved the completion of a very extensive questionnaire by an objective observer; the thoroughness of the questionnaire may have discouraged its more extensive use.

This brief review does not describe all of the attempts to provide some outside evaluation of study abroad programs. Probably none of these projects could be deemed a success in achieving its original goals. They, however, did serve to clarify the differing needs for evaluation which the students, faculty, parents and sponsoring institutions have. More importantly, the attention given to the element of educational quality in the development and operation of these evaluative schemes served to create some consensus about what elements a "good" study abroad program should have and alerted sponsoring institutions to the need to pay attention to those elements that contribute to the quality of their programs.

These experiments with outside evaluation may have also contributed to the development of more helpful internal evaluations by the sponsoring institutions. Institutions vary widely in their approaches to the evaluation of their own overseas programs. The high visibility of overseas programs may attract the critical attention of faculty in some institutions; at others, the remote location may result in very little attention. At some institutions the evaluation may be limited to visits by the administrator of overseas programs. In others there may be visits by academic officers or faculty committees. Academic responsibility may rest with related departments on the home campus, with interdepartmental committees, or with an academic vice president. At a few institutions, outside consultants may have been employed to conduct evaluations of overseas programs.

How Should Study Abroad Programs be Evaluated?

Few issues in education arouse controversy so quickly as those that deal with evaluation, quality in education, accreditation and accountability. Assessments of study abroad programs are no exception.

The first point to be made is that each of the individuals and institutions which has anything to do with a study abroad program has a legitimate need for an objective assessment of the program and each assessment will be based on different criteria. The prospective student enrollees need to decide whether to commit their time -- and their parents' money -- to the program, and they need a wide range of information. They will want to know if they can cope academically and personally with the experience and whether it moves them appropriately toward graduation and professional preparation. They may also want to know what opportunity it provides for social contact with the opposite sex. The academic advisor to whom they may turn for help needs the same data. The host university abroad wants to know if the students and staff are competent to benefit from the instruction offered without making unacceptable demands on the host faculty or facilities. Registrars need the data to make decisions on the appropriate amount and type of academic credit to award. The sponsoring institution needs to know whether the program conforms to its academic standards in a number of areas. Each of these concerns, as well as those of other contributors, indicates a need for objective review, evaluation and assessment.

The special problem in evaluating study abroad is that the action takes place several thousand miles away from the home campus. In evaluating a course of study on the home campus, the evaluators involved may be in daily contact with the students and professors who are currently engaged in the course in question; not so in assessing study abroad programs. Judgments are also made more difficult by the fact that the action takes place in a foreign culture; a student's performance must be assessed differently when all of the student's papers, for instance, are being written in a language which the student is still learning.

Can one say then whether the information that is now furnished and the professional judgments now being made about study abroad programs are so complete and accurate that the actors mentioned above can make informed decisions? There must be two answers. For programs sponsored by a single or several institutions and primarily serving students from the sponsoring institution(s), the students, faculty, advisors and deans probably have well-informed assessments of the programs and can intelligently make the decisions they need to make about the programs. They have regular contact with returned students; they may see regular reports from the directors and administrators; some may have visited the overseas site. Advisors may know whether the students they advised to go on the programs actually had a successful experience abroad.

A different answer must be given for institutions with little direct contact with the programs to which their students go. Without regular reports or regular feedback from directors or from returning students, it is doubtful if students, advisors, or registrars can make informed decisions. The same situation may exist in any institution if it does not provide its students, faculty and advisors the information about the programs that is available through institutional channels. The consequences of decisions can lead to wasted time and money for students and their parents, and to educational failures for the institutions.

One would hope therefore that there would be an increasingly close relation between colleges and universities and the study abroad programs to which they send their students. This is probably not the case. As has been noted elsewhere, institutions are not expanding their own study abroad programs at a pace which matches the increased student interest in opportunities for foreign study. A greater number of students are therefore enrolling in programs that are not closely related to their home campuses; students and their advisors may therefore be making less well informed decisions about enrollment in such programs. It is not just that unrelated programs offer experiences of lesser educational value -- although this is clearly sometimes the case.

More frequently students may enroll in programs that are not appropriate to their undergraduate careers; through lack of information they may fail to enroll in the programs that could contribute most to their educational and personal development.

Many of those professionally involved in study abroad feel that there is a dearth of accurate and objective information about many overseas study opportunities and hope that some solutions to this problem can be found.

The Future of Evaluation

As study abroad programs become an established fixture in American higher education, there is a clear need for greater effort to gather, assess and publish information about study abroad programs. The distant location of the study site necessitates more reporting of these programs than of those that are located close at hand. Given the variety of information that is needed by people with differing professional roles, there is no single professional group that can assume full responsibility for this endeavor. The broadest approach to this task is necessary.

The institutions which sponsor study abroad programs need to be more systematic about the evaluations they perform and to make the reports of these evaluations widely available to students, faculty and staff who make personal or professional decisions about their roles in the program.

Professional organizations whose members have special concerns about study abroad programs should continue to expand their efforts to secure and disseminate information about the elements of the programs that are of concern to them.

The regional accrediting agencies need to continue their efforts to make the review of study abroad programs a regular part of the accreditation process. This practice has already made institutions aware of the special oversight that needs to be exercised when programs are operated far from the home campus. Further thought needs to be given to the manner in which study abroad programs are included in the accreditation process; the process should result in the production and dissemination of fuller reports about the overseas programs.

Scholarly attention must also be more frequently given to the study abroad programs. The research skills of a number of disciplines could be usefully devoted to further study of the educational problems and achievements of our study abroad programs.

PART IX: CURRENT PROBLEMS IN STUDY ABROAD

Any predictions about the future of study abroad programs need to take into consideration several serious problems which now face the administrators of these programs.

The Need to Expand Opportunities for Foreign Study

One safe conclusion about study abroad programs is that the number of students enrolling in them is bound to increase. According to our Program Survey, the number of formal programs abroad has shown an increase each year since 1951. The responses of 82 institutions conducting study abroad programs indicated that these institutions announced 14 new programs to begin in the academic year 1984-85. When asked whether student interest and enrollment in study abroad was increasing or decreasing, none of the respondents to the Opinion Survey reported decreases, 75% reported increases and 25% reported that interest and enrollments were remaining about the same. Additional American educational institutions are inaugurating study abroad programs of their own each year.

A check on enrollment figures for ten of the largest programs administered by agencies other than colleges or universities indicates that some show increasing enrollments and others decreasing enrollments. However, there is a slight increase in the total number of students enrolled in these programs and there also appear to be new programs reported each year (IIE, 1984).

The need for expanding study abroad opportunities is not just the need for accommodating larger numbers of students. There is also need for a greater variety in the type of programs offered. Each language department is interested in a program where its language is spoken as the native language. Some students opt for the greater economy of spending an entire year abroad; others can only be abroad for a semester due to the requirements of their academic majors. Students in some pre-professional courses cannot incorporate extensive language and literature credits in their main course of study and need courses in science, business, etc. There is a need for programs designed to accept students at different levels in the development of language skills.

There are few institutions which now have or will develop an array of foreign programs adequate to satisfy the academic needs and educational interests of all of their students. A few private institutions send most of their students abroad -- Goshen, Kalamazoo, Lewis & Clark, while a few larger institutions enroll a majority of their students in study abroad programs -- Stanford and Antioch. Some large universities have dozens of overseas programs but still accommodate only a small portion of the huge student population -- the University of California, the California State University system and the State University of New York. However, all of these programs were first established 19 to 29 years ago, and there is no indication that additional institutions are now establishing or contemplating programs on this scale.

At the present time, the task of setting up new programs overseas is becoming more complicated and difficult. Some foreign universities which already host American programs are reluctant to accept additional groups; there are still shortages of classrooms, professors, office space, library facilities and student housing at many institutions. Costs of all of these are escalating rapidly abroad (although currently decreased by the favorable exchange rate for the U.S. dollar), and some countries have introduced special fees for foreign students or

American groups. Negotiating programs with institutions which have not previously accommodated American groups is time consuming and difficult. Setting up programs independent of any host institution involves additional costs, complex regulations, and social taxes on payrolls; in addition, the task of exposing students to the host society is more complicated for programs existing outside of the academic community. Few institutions are now prepared to make the commitment of academic staff needed to cope with these problems.

The Need to Preserve Cross-Cultural Encounter

The cultural adjustment which the average American student was required to make when arriving to study in Paris -- or Poitiers -- in the 1950s is significantly different from the adjustment the student needs to make in the 1980s. The student in the 1950s had to adjust to the shortages of many things -- the artifacts of daily life -- which were freely available in the United States but hard to find in a Europe slowly recovering from the economic disasters of World War II. Today these artifacts are freely available in any Western country; one's favorite brand of toothpaste may be manufactured by the same multinational corporation in many parts of the world and freely available in the local drug store of scores of countries.

Adjustment to political attitudes abroad is also different; each decade has posed problems for the American student -- the "American Go Home" campaign of the 1950s, the disgust with the Vietnam adventure in the 1960s, the bafflement with Watergate in the 1970s and the dismay with Reagan in the 1980s. Students have not found it so difficult to comprehend these attitudes in the more recent decades. With greater linguistic competence, students can still encounter interesting and meaningful differences in the way Europeans and Americans think, but the immediate challenge to the students arriving abroad is not so acute.

The university students who will be going abroad to study in the future will be much more sophisticated about international travel than those who went in the past. Many have been abroad on brief, and probably not very rewarding excursions as high school students. Many come from families that have lived and traveled abroad. Few will be encountering a foreign culture for the first time. A larger number of them will be from academic disciplines other than language, literature and the humanities; many of them will be from business or science and will want courses and academic credits in their field. The new generation of students in the programs will be significantly different.

Some aspects of the programs which expose the students to cultural differences are no longer so easy to arrange. Living with a local family in a way in which one becomes a part of family life is no longer an option in the major European cities due to reductions in the size of families and in the size of their apartments. Many programs operate outside the university, and that has reduced contacts with local students. The sheer numbers of American students and American tourists that one finds in major European cities serves to dilute the encounter with the foreign culture.

Programs attempt to compensate for these changes. Some have provided for short visits to more provincial towns. Others promote participation in student activities such as sports, clubs, music groups, student excursions, etc. A number of programs arrange for students to assist with English teaching in local schools. It has, nevertheless, become more difficult to assure the challenge of cultural adjustment in a world of extensive international travel and communication.

Problems of Third World Programs

The expansion and successful operation of study abroad programs in Asia, Africa and Latin America still present seemingly intractable problems for many colleges and universities. Nearly every evaluation of the study abroad movement has pointed out that 90% of the students who study abroad are located in Western Europe, that Americans lack an understanding of the cultures and interests of non-European countries, and that if the United States is to deal successfully with the problems of the 90% of the world's peoples who live in Africa, Asia and Latin America, our programs need to enroll more than the 0.02% of American undergraduates who now go there to study.

The evidence is that the sponsors of study abroad programs have attempted to respond to this need; for the most part, they have failed. Of the 395 study abroad programs reported in our Program Survey, 96 were established in Africa, Asia or Latin America.* However, 25 of these were terminated within five years of their establishment whereas only 15 of the 279 programs established within Europe were closed. The higher rate of failure is only part of the problem. The average size of a European program is about 33 while the average size of the non-European program is 17 (Appendix, Chart II).

It must be noted further that the largest and most successful programs in Asia are in Israel and in Japan -- hardly the countries where students would acquire an understanding of the impoverished populations of the Third World. The IIE survey for 1982-83 reports 3,601 American students in overseas programs in Africa, Asia and Latin America or slightly more than one in ten. In Africa, there were 159 students reported; in Asia there were 1,942 students with 1,341 in Israel, 276 in Japan and only 325 in the rest of Asia; in Latin America there were 1,121 students in Mexico and only 383 in the rest of Latin America (IIE, 1984).

The real explanation for these startling statistics is that the dominant aspects of our American culture derive from our European heritage -- the music our orchestras play is European in origin, the literature in our libraries grows out of our European traditions, our visual arts are predominantly European; our religious institutions are essentially derivatives of European antecedents. The humanities curriculum of our undergraduate education is largely a study of European themes. On the whole, American universities have been more successful in fostering the study of non-European languages, religions and art history than the study abroad programs have been in directing their students to those areas. To expect otherwise might be to expect the tail to wag the dog.

The experienced observers who were consulted for our Opinion Survey were requested to comment on enrollment trends in the Third World programs of their institutions. Eight reported that enrollments were decreasing, four thought they were about the same and only three reported an increase in enrollments. When asked about their expectations for the future, however, eight thought enrollments would increase, four thought they would remain the same, and only one person expected a decrease.

---

*As noted above, these figures are somewhat distorted since ten is regarded as the minimum number to be enrolled in European programs in order to be listed in the reports for the Program Survey, while five is the minimum for non-European programs.

The eight optimists may have been whistling in the dark. When asked to indicate what steps might be taken to increase enrollment in these programs, there was little agreement among the respondents. A number of suggestions related to financial problems -- suggesting that fees be reduced or that there be subsidies for transportation, language preparation, faculty costs or development costs. Others suggested that better facilities abroad, more stable political conditions, more faculty support or better promotion in the United States might help solve the problem.

These suggestions center on two problems -- finances and enrollment. The concern about finances is indeed pertinent. On a per student basis, the cost of sending a faculty member to Asia or Africa to direct a program or the expense of an administrator's trip to establish or to review a program is staggering when the average program enrollment is so small. While some living costs may be absurdly cheap in a given country, other necessities of life may be quite expensive. Student transportation costs are nearly always high.

If lower costs and better promotion were to result in significantly higher enrollment in programs in Third World countries, the per student cost would be substantially reduced. However, there is little likelihood that program numbers there can ever duplicate the average size of programs in European countries. Programs in less developed countries are nearly always limited by the difficulty of finding adequate housing and study facilities and by political pressures on enrollments in the universities.

It is little wonder that so many institutions have been forced to terminate their programs in these areas; it is surprising that so many have been able to continue to operate them.

PART X: THE FUTURE OF STUDY ABROAD

It is difficult to predict whether colleges and universities will commit the funds and staff needed to deal with the problems of study abroad programs in the future. A number of our experienced observers reported that they had received little support from their administrations when their programs began, but all reported that they now had the solid backing of the university administration and that they expected this support to continue. (Notably, the administrators of those few university programs which have been discontinued were not on the mailing list and their presumably negative reports on administrative support were not included in our survey.) The evidence certainly is that study abroad programs are an attractive aspect of the undergraduate curriculum; with the current competition for undergraduate students, it seems likely that most institutions will continue their support of study abroad programs.

Nevertheless, this is a period of financial constraints and budget crises, and most of the suggested ways in which the university can respond to these problems involve financial commitments. It seems wise, therefore, to put forth the following points as suggestions rather than predictions.

Expanding Program Opportunities

There is little doubt that colleges and universities will continue to establish new programs overseas. Colleges that have not had programs will set them up and colleges with existing programs will expand into new language areas as student demand grows.

Because of staff limitations and the cost of new programs, there will be greater dependence on consortial programs or programs set up in cooperation with other institutions. There is likely to be increased use of programs set up by non-academic agencies or even by commercial enterprises; this development may, however, be limited because of the increasing attention being given to academic control and supervision of those aspects of the programs which affect educational quality.

With the increase in the number of faculty with extensive overseas experience in all departments, the skill and initiative needed to set up new programs may reside in departments not normally associated with study abroad programs. Schools of business, architecture, engineering and the like already have set up study abroad programs, and this trend will certainly increase.

There are several trends in campus staffing for international programs. There is a steady increase in the number of institutions appointing a Director of International Programs or someone with a similar title. Not all of these are faculty appointments; a number of these are staff level posts. Alternatively, the title may be given to someone with several other responsibilities. The need for competent staff is certainly growing. If an institution is setting up new programs, it needs competent staff to deal with the increasing complexity of this task. If it is relying on programs administered by other institutions or agencies, it needs competent staff to make judgments about the quality of those programs and competent staff to advise students which of these programs will best satisfy their educational interests and academic requirements.

The Cross-Cultural Challenge

In order to conserve the experience of cultural adjustment, it has become more important that these new programs be located at universities that do not already have large numbers of programs and in cities -- smaller ones especially -- where students may encounter more of the cultural flavor of the host country.

Technical and pre-professional students will gain by being located in technical schools which will not have been hosting the more traditional study abroad programs.

Resident directors will need to encourage types of student activities which put students in closer contact with local people. They will need the academic flexibility to incorporate many of these experiences as regular parts of their programs' curricula.

Greater responsibility for aiding students to become involved in the community will rest with the resident director. This adds to the director's many faceted job description and may call for new considerations in the selection of the resident director. In addition to his academic and administrative tasks, he needs to have the ability and knowledge to introduce the student to the local culture.

The Problems of Third World Programs

Universities will not succeed in sending a significant number of students to Third World countries until there is a curricular reform that gives greater emphasis to the study of Third World languages, cultures and economic and political problems. When the period abroad becomes a part of such curricular emphasis, there will be adequate interest in and support for programs in these areas.

Academic flexibility will be a requisite factor in expanding Third World programs; reproduction of the course content and instructional practices of the home campus in a Third World university is seldom possible and rarely desirable. Experiential learning is the chief benefit to be gained from many of these programs, and the educational approach should provide the fullest opportunity for such experiences.

The U.S. government and private foundations will continue to provide some financial support for programs in the Third World, particularly in India, the U.S.S.R., China and Latin America. Budget problems make substantial increases in government subsidies unlikely; corporate contributions may provide some assistance. The institutions sponsoring these programs will need to continue to make a substantial commitment of funds, as the administration of programs in the Third World will continue to be expensive and difficult.

In Conclusion

Whether institutions administer their own programs or rely on programs administered by others, the important task is the development in each college and university of a deep interest in and concern for the quality of the overseas academic programs in which their students participate. The institutions need to provide adequate administrative budgets for the supervision of programs. They

need to provide a competent and well funded office to advise students about study abroad opportunities provided by their own and other institutions and organizations.

The phenomenal expansion of study abroad programs in the 1960s and 1970s took place because those working in the field had the direct support -- and frequently the personal involvement -- of college and university presidents and deans. There is every indication that the interest of these officials is still there. They need to be made aware of current needs in the study abroad field and encouraged to give their support to efforts to expand and improve the programs which can be offered to their students.

APPENDIX

CHART I

DATES OF STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS SPONSORED BY 82 U.S. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

	Total Programs		Western Europe		Africa/Asia Latin America		Other[1]	
	Opened	Closed	Opened	Closed	Opened	Closed	Opened	Closed
Pre-WW II	7	1	7	1				
1946-50	3		3					
1951-55	6		6					
1956-60	21	3	18		3			
1961-65	76		62		14			
1966-70	89	5	55	1	32	4	2	
1971-75	83	15	56	6	21	8	6	1
1976-80	62	15	43	6	14	8	5	1
1981-84[2]	48	8	29	2	18	5	1	1
	395	47	279	16	102	25	14	3

(1) Includes USSR, Yugoslavia, New Zealand, Australia, Canada.
(2) Represents four years instead of five as in previous periods.

CHART II

NUMBER OF STUDY ABROAD PROGRAMS SPONSORED BY 82 U.S. COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES BY AREAS OF THE WORLD

Areas		Number of Programs Opened	Closed	Operating Now	Average No. of Participants	Estimated Total Participants in Current Programs
LATIN AMERICA	Mexico	18	4	14	32	—
	Other (1) Countries	24	9	15	17	—
	Totals	42	13	29	49	667
ASIA	Israel	13	2	11	19	
	Japan	11	—	11	13	
	Other Countries	20	5	15	12	
	Totals	44	7	37		555
AFRICA		16	5	11	9	99
Totals for Latin America, Asia, Africa		102	25	77		1,321
WESTERN EUROPE		279	15	264	33	8,712
OTHER (2)		14	3	11	18	198
Grand Total		395	43	352		11,552

(1) Includes Haiti, Guadaloupe, and the Virgin Islands
(2) Includes USSR, Yugoslavia, New Zealand, Austrailia, Canada

BIBLIOGRAPHY AND SOURCES OF DATA

Abrams, Irwin. *Study Abroad*. Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1960.

——. "The Evolution of Undergraduate Study Programs Abroad" in *International Educational and Cultural Exchange*. Washington: U.S. Department of State, Spring 1968.

——. "The Student Abroad." Chapter 4 in *Higher Education: Some Newer Developments*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.

Abrams, Irwin and Francis Heller. *Evaluating Academic Programs Abroad: The CIEE Project*. CIEE Occasional Paper No. 20. New York: CIEE, 1978.

Altenhofen, Sister Aurelia. "Foreign Study Programs." Chapter 6 in *Rosary College: Transition and Progress*. River Forest: Rosary College Press, 1977.

Brown, M. Archer. "U.S. Students Abroad." Chapter 3 in *Educating Students from Other Nations*, by Hugh Jenkins et al. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1983.

Burn, Barbara. *Expanding the International Dimensions of Higher Education*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, 1980.

Burn, Barbara and Maryélise Lamet. "The University of Massachusetts at Amherst." Chapter 2 in *Approaches to International Education*, edited by Earl L. Backman. New York: MacMillan, 1985.

Clayton, John M., Jr. "Foreign Study Records (1922-1948): An Inventory." Unpublished paper, Archives, University of Delaware, Newark, 1970.

CIEE. *A Guide to the Institutional Self-Study and Evaluation of Educational Programs Abroad*. New York: CIEE, 1965.

Cleveland, Harlan. "The Option of Study Overseas." *National Educational Association Journal*. March 1960.

Cleveland, Harlan and J.C. Adams. *The Overseas Americans*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Ebelke, John F. Private letter to John A. Garraty. Detroit: Wayne State University, 1958.

—— "Statement on German Junior Year Abroad." Memorandum to the Council of Deans. Detroit: Wayne State University, 1951.

Educational Reconstruction Conference. Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1949.

Elkin, Judith Laikin. *The Great Lakes Colleges Association: Twenty-one Years of Cooperation in Higher Education*. Ann Arbor: GLCA, 1982.

Fraser, Steward. (ed.). *Governmental Policy and International Education*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965.

Freeman, Stephen A. *The Middlebury College Foreign Language Schools*. Middlebury: Middlebury College Press, 1975.

Garraty, John A. and Adams, Walter. *From Main Street to the Left Bank: Students and Scholars Abroad*. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1959.

Hess, Gerhard. *Freshmen and Sophmores Abroad: Community Colleges and Overseas Academic Programs.* New York: Teachers College, 1982.

Hull, W. Frank IV, et al. *The American Undergraduate Off-Campus and Overseas: A Study of the Educational Validity of Such Programs.* CIEE Occasional Paper No. 21. New York: CIEE, 1978.

Institute of International Education. *Foreign Study for U.S. Undergraduates: A Survey of College Programs and Policies.* New York: IIE, 1950.

——. "History of Council on the Junior Year Abroad." Mimeo. New York: IIE, 1950.

——. *Open Doors 1981-82.* New York: IIE, 1983.

——. *Open Doors 1982-83.* New York: IIE, 1984.

——. *Transplanted Students: A Report of the National Conference on Undergraduate Study Abroad.* New York: IIE, 1961.

——. *U.S. College-Sponsored Programs Abroad: Academic Year, The Learning Traveler.* Vol . I. New York: IIE, 1984.

Klineberg, Otto and W. Frank Hull IV. *At a Foreign University: An International Study of Adaptation and Coping.* New York: Praeger, 1979.

Koester, Jolene. *Profile of the U.S. Student Abroad.* New York: CIEE, 1985.

Matthew, R.J. *25 Years on the Left Bank.* Sweet Briar: Sweet Briar College Press, 1973.

Oldt, Esther A. "Antioch Education Abroad: An Evaluation," Report No. 10, *Antioch College Reports.* Yellow Springs: Antioch University Press, May 1969.

Pace, C. Robert. *The Junior Year in France: An Evaluation of the University of Delaware-Sweet Briar College Program.* Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1959.

Purkaple, Ruth H. (ed.). *A Report on Ten Years of Study Abroad Programs at the University of Colorado.* Boulder: Office of Study Abroad, University of Colorado, 1979.

Rogers, Francis M. *American Juniors on the Left Bank.* Sweet Briar: Sweet Briar College, 1958.

University of California, *The Tieline: A Newsletter.* Vol. I, No. 1 and No. 2. Santa Barbara: Education Abroad Program, University of California-Santa Barbara, 1982.

Ward, J. Paul. "SUNY's Commitment to Foreign Students: A Historical Perspective." *International Programs Quarterly.* Vol. I, No. 2. Albany: SUNY Press, 1985.

Weidner, Edward W. *The International Programs at American Universities.* East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1958.

CIEE OCCASIONAL PAPERS SERIES
GUIDELINES FOR SUBMISSION

Since 1965, the Council on International Educational Exchange has published 24 Occasional Papers on a variety of subjects in the field of international education.

Purpose of an Occasional Paper:
The Occasional Papers Series publishes noteworthy scholarship and serves as a forum for the dissemination of provocative thinking in the field of international educational exchange. The series addresses issues of interest to academics and professionals involved with all aspects of international education. Each paper approved for publication shall be part of either the Research Series or the Forum Series.

A submission should fulfill any one or more of the following purposes:

A. Research Series: contributions to scholarly research in the field of international education; any competent research methodology, whether historical, analytical or experimental, may serve as the basis of the research reported.
B. Forum Series: contributions to the development of new or existing ideas in the field international education; papers may be texts of speeches, think pieces or descriptions of projects which reflect the knowledge and provocative ideas of practitioners in international education.

Style:
1) Manuscripts must be typed, double-spaced with 1 1/2 inch right-hand margin; a one a one inch left-hand margin; a one inch top margin and 1 1/2 inch bottom margin. Three copies should be submitted; if return of manuscript is requested, a stamped, self-addressed envelope must be included.
2) The manuscript should include a title page (with the name and address of the author, date of submission and the number of pages submitted) and a one page abstract or outline of the paper, reflecting the salient points of the submission.
3) Manuscript pages should be numbered sequentially, starting with a first page (excluding the title page). Numbering should include appendices and bibliography.
4) The length of the manuscript should generally be between ten typed pages and no more than 50 typed pages.
5) The paper should be accompanied by a bibliography and appendices, as appropriate.
6) The manuscript should follow the basic style outlined in a recognized style book, such as the Modern Language Association Style Sheet, APA or Chicago Manual of Style.

Review Process and Selection:
The Council's Board of Directors appoint an Editor for a 3-year term. The Editor in consultation with the Professional Affairs Committee, appoint an Editorial Board. In consultation with the Editorial Board, the Editor is responsible for the establishment of guidelines on submission of papers, the review of any paper submitted, and the subsequent selection of papers which may be considered for publication as an Occasional Paper.

A final decision regarding publication will be made within four months of receipt by the Editor. The Editor, in consultation with the Editorial Board, will appoint appropriate reviewer(s), who shall remain anonymous to the author. The recommendations generated by

the reviewer(s) will be made available to the Editor and the Editorial Board, and to the author, by request. Upon publication of an Occasional Paper deemed controversial by the Editor, a responding paper may be solicited.

All papers published as Occasional Papers will be copyrighted by the Council; permission for reproduction must be granted by the Council.
Mail submissions to:

Maryêlise and Sterling Lamet
Editors--CIEE Occasional Papers Series
International Programs Office
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003
Phone: (413) 545-2710

CIEE OCCASIONAL PAPERS SERIES

EDITORS:

Maryêlise Lamet
University of Massachusetts - Amherst

Sterling Lamet
University of Massachusetts - Amherst

EDITORIAL BOARD:

Stephen Cooper
Louisiana State University

Gail Hochhauser
International Education Consultant

Paula Spier
Antioch University

Henry Weaver
University of California

Barbara B. Burn
University of Massachusetts - Amherst
Ex Officio

Joseph Hickey
Council on International Educational Exchange
Ex Officio

Colleen Zarich
Council on International Educational Exchange
Ex Officio

ABOUT CIEE

The Council on International Educational Exchange is a private, non-profit, membership organization, incorporated in the United States with international offices, affiliations and representation. Major responsibilities and contributions to the field of educational exchange, throughout its 40 years of service to the academic community, have established the Council as one of the foremost organizations concerned with international education and student travel.

The Council was founded in 1947 by a small group of organizations active in the field of international education and student travel in order to help re-establish student exchange after World War II. In its early years the Council chartered ocean liners for transatlantic student sailings, arranged group air travel and organized orientation programs to prepare students and teachers for their educational experiences abroad. Over the years the Council's mandate broadened dramatically with the ever-increasing number of its academic members whose interests spread beyond Europe to Africa, Asia and Latin America. Today, the Council assumes important educational responsibilities and develops, facilitates and administers programs of international educational exchange throughout the world on behalf of both its national and international constituencies.